

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Turner Bartels K 8 School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	22
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Turner Bartels K 8 School

9190 IMPERIAL OAK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: R. Lamarr Buggs, Jr

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	22
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Turner Bartels K 8 School

9190 IMPERIAL OAK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Through relationships student achievement will be fostered using engaging activities, data-driven standard-based instruction, and unconditional regard for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building genuine relationships to ensure the success of all stakeholders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Buggs, Robert	Principal	Staff Evaluations Classroom Observations Counts Maintenance Clerical Budget Hiring Social Studies Electives
Enis, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule Articulation/Attrition Subject Area Leaders Testing MS Field trips MS Guidance Schedule changes 8th Grade/6th Grade MTSS/RTI Athletics
Perez-Reinaldo, Michelle	Assistant Principal	PK - 2nd Volunteers Testing iReady SIPPS Pictures Principal Weekly LC Duty Data Walls Field Trips Scheduling Elem Guidance Specials Testing Elem MTSS Keys Walkies Grades/Report Cards PLC Progress Reports Team Leaders
Quinta, Cynthia	Assistant Principal	3rd - 6th Volunteers Testing iReady Elem MTSS Grades/Report Cards

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		PLC Progress Reports Team Leaders Data Walls Scheduling Elem Guidance

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/29/2019, R. Lamarr Buggs, Jr

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

114

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,528

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	124	139	136	168	155	184	188	196	216	0	0	0	0	1506
Attendance below 90 percent	26	16	10	19	18	21	38	47	57	0	0	0	0	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	3	17	13	18	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	12	17	38	40	42	0	0	0	0	170
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	25	22	31	33	34	0	0	0	0	170
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators		0	0	0	1	2	2	11	16	12	0	0	0	44

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year		0	1	0	5	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 12/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	119	136	147	156	183	163	214	212	209	0	0	0	0	1539
Attendance below 90 percent	7	8	10	9	10	6	48	41	54	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	11	38	47	38	0	0	0	0	145
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	15	60	50	41	0	0	0	0	175

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	119	136	147	156	183	163	214	212	209	0	0	0	0	1539
Attendance below 90 percent	7	8	10	9	10	6	48	41	54	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	11	38	47	38	0	0	0	0	145
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	15	60	50	41	0	0	0	0	175

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				63%	57%	61%	64%	59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	56%	59%	60%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	54%	48%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				62%	55%	62%	63%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains				62%	57%	59%	63%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	49%	52%	42%	47%	52%
Science Achievement				59%	50%	56%	64%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				68%	77%	78%	63%	79%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	70%	52%	18%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
06	2021					
	2019	50%	53%	-3%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
07	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2021					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	60%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2021					
	2019	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
07	2021					
	2019	61%	62%	-1%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2021					
	2019	22%	31%	-9%	46%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	70%	51%	19%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	48%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	63%	67%	-4%	71%	-8%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	91%	63%	28%	61%	30%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

IReady K-5 6-8 Math only.

Math Monthly K-5

Brightfish (6-8 Reading)

Unit Common Assessments (All middle school subjects)

Data walls to capture and monitor student progress.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	61	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	47	64
	Students With Disabilities	34	40	56
	English Language Learners	12	32	32
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	49	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	31	50
	Students With Disabilities	23	42	69
	English Language Learners	0	32	48

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54	69	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	62	71
	Students With Disabilities	41	48	64
	English Language Learners	30	53	65
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	55	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	44	63
	Students With Disabilities	30	50	61
	English Language Learners	15	33	44
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	72	77	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	64	73
	Students With Disabilities	59	62	69
	English Language Learners	29	32	47
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38	48	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	30	46
	Students With Disabilities	37	52	59
	English Language Learners	7	11	26

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70	75	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	59	64	68
	Students With Disabilities	74	77	79
	English Language Learners	38	50	51
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45	53	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	37	49
	Students With Disabilities	57	61	69
	English Language Learners	11	20	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75	77	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	65	67	72
	Students With Disabilities	77	82	86
	English Language Learners	46	40	51
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45	57	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	38	44
	Students With Disabilities	62	69	77
	English Language Learners	8	24	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	67.8	66.8	
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.5	47.5	
	Students With Disabilities	78.5	72.7	
	English Language Learners	18.7	30.8	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	39	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	12	16
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	20
	English Language Learners	4	17	21
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33	41	
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	41	
	Students With Disabilities	33	45	
	English Language Learners	29	34	
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	32	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	20	23
	Students With Disabilities	32	37	40
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46	32	
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	22	
	Students With Disabilities	50	39	
	English Language Learners	19	11	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	40	60	
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	50	
	Students With Disabilities	69	64	
	English Language Learners	18	40	

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	40	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	22	23
	Students With Disabilities	31	39	39
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	30	
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	21	
	Students With Disabilities	43	40	
	English Language Learners	25	18	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	47	42	
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	35	
	Students With Disabilities	42	35	
	English Language Learners	7	35	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24	34	37	18	33	26	24	29			
ELL	31	36	35	30	36	29	20	31	57		
ASN	84	72		78	50	18	70	90	88		
BLK	41	42	31	30	27	28	39	56	42		
HSP	45	38	29	34	35	32	38	45	48		
MUL	64	63		60	40		56	91			
WHT	63	54	52	56	49	37	62	68	64		
FRL	39	39	34	29	30	29	31	46	40		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	43	39	21	43	43	18	29			
ELL	31	56	53	40	56	43	36	27			

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	84	77	69	90	83		84	88	96		
BLK	51	51	48	45	51	40	38	66	75		
HSP	52	53	39	51	59	44	49	58	91		
MUL	69	59		71	79		79	92	100		
WHT	68	63	47	68	61	42	69	70	94		
FRL	46	52	42	45	54	44	43	57	85		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	20	35	36	17	26	26	20	28			
ELL	33	57	55	33	52	49	11	41			
ASN	84	68	53	90	83		86	75			
BLK	51	52	48	47	49	33	44	54	65		
HSP	58	59	47	54	57	45	57	52	92		
MUL	66	63	64	69	71	45	71				
WHT	68	61	47	68	68	46	72	80	86		
FRL	50	53	50	48	51	39	48	52	73		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

*Overall middle school math is trending downward. Grades 6-8 each fall below the district average.
 *Civics is trending up. Began the year as the worst performing school in the district. Mid-year reports indicate scores of less than 2 points below the district average.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Middle school math.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Address classroom instructional delivery. Improve team instructional planning. More consistent progress monitoring. Increase tutoring opportunities for students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

N/A

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

N/A

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Planning as a team more frequently and with purpose. Stronger PLC's. Increase level of engagement activities, probe to allow students to think critically, with appropriate feedback. Small group instruction.

Continue using our PBIS to encourage students stay engaged and welcome success.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teacher-led CHAMPS training, Highly Effective Teacher training (Domain 3), and Small-Group training.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Follow-through and accountability of quality-led planning and instruction, progress monitoring, and procedures and systems.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Through district walkthroughs and feedback, it was determined that our instructional planning should improve to maximize student learning.

Measurable Outcome:

The expected outcome is to increase students FSA and progress monitoring scores all students in both reading and math, and specifically in middle school math. This can be obtained with stronger PLC's, collaborative lesson planning for rigorous content, giving ownership to students for their work and their demonstration of learning.

Monitoring:

District and school-level walkthroughs with feedback. Formal and Informal observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Buggs (robert.buggs@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

On-campus professional development opportunities such as, CHAMPS training for classroom management. Highly Effective Teacher training for rigorous instruction, academic ownership, and demonstration of learning (assessing). Small-group training to address students with disabilities and Tier 2 and 3 students. District and school-level discussion and ratings of walkthroughs. Formal and Informal observations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Immediate feedback from walkthroughs and observations will provide insight to implementation of training practices and school-wide priorities. Also provides immediate responses to teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

On-campus professional development opportunities such as, CHAMPS training for classroom management. Highly Effective Teacher training for rigorous instruction, academic ownership, and demonstration of learning (assessing). Small-group training will address students with disabilities and Tier 2 and 3 students. Other trainings that impact learning are: SchoolCity, Flipgrid, and NearPod.

Person Responsible

Robert Buggs (robert.buggs@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In 2019, Turner/Bartels K-8 recorded 3.4 incidents per 100 students. This percentage falls in the very high category according to School Safety Dashboard. Violent incidents occur 2.86 per 100 hundred students and property incidents occur .23 out of 100 students. Both incident categories are considered very high when compared according to the School Safety Dashboard.

Physical Attacks and Threats will be closely monitored and minimized. Monitoring of behavior must be more consistent overall. Procedures and protocols are in place, however addressing these concerns before they happen, must be enforced on a more consistent basis.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

First Turner/Bartels K-8 has a strong Student Services staff that supports the mental, social, and academic needs of students. Four School Counselors, 2.5 School Resource Counselors, and one School Psychologist.

At Turner/Bartels, we believe in the TBK8 Way! The TBK8 Way! are action words that identifies a behavior for everyone to follow: Be Respectful, Be Responsible, and Be Engaged.

We also has an extensive PBIS committee that supports the social, personal, and academic culture of the school. The PBIS committee is broken down in several sub committees that addresses that focuses on the positive and recognizes student achievements. Tiger Stripes is the school's "currency" that is rewarded to students who are in uniform, displays good behavior, follow our electronics and tardy policy. With Tiger Stripes, students can purchase items from our Tiger store or they can hold on to the stripes for bigger items like, a day out of uniform, golf cart ride with the AP, lunch with the principal...which surprisingly is a big seller! Posters are

Every homeroom teacher recognizes a STEM Student of the Month to those who are demonstrating our STEM Character Traits of each month.

Honor Roll students are awarded and recognized every quarter with a week of celebration, ending with a cookout.

School and PTSA sponsored activities that invites all students regardless of behavior or academics.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

PTSA: Support teachers, staff, and students in providing resources, such as grants and donations. Provide meals, uniforms, and fun activities year round.

Business Partners: Supports various programs throughout the school year providing services to students and staff.

School Committees: Various school committees are designed to tackle events throughout the school year as a team led by staff members, such as Veterans Day, PBIS Team, Student Awards, etc.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
Total:			\$6,500.00